

REMARKS

Claims 1–13 and 15 are currently pending. All pending claims have been amended to better conform with U.S. practice. Claims 8 and 12 have been amended to address the Examiner's objections. Amendments and arguments regarding the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1–13 and 15 are presented in the Listing of Claims and in the sections below. Claim 14 previously was canceled. No new matter has been added.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to Claims 8 and 12. Claim 8 has been amended to include the possibility of more than one polymer. The compounds 2-oxo-1,3-dioxolan-4-ylmethyl acrylate and 2-oxo-1,3-dioxolan-4-ylmethyl methacrylate have been deleted from Claim 12. Applicants believe these amendments completely address the Examiner's objections. Applicants respectfully request that, in view of these amendments, the Examiner withdraw his objections to Claims 8 and 12.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected Claim 10 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Frischinger et al. In Frischinger et al., the polyamine is an alkylenediamine. Applicants have amended the final section of Claim 10 beginning with "or if k is an integer of more than 1, X is" so that alkylenediamine polyamines are excluded. In view of this amendment, Applicants believe Claim 10 cannot be construed to read on Frischinger et al. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 12 as anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) by Fukada et al. (US 2003/0134926) in view of his allegation that Fukada et al. teaches 2-oxo-1,3-dioxolane-4-yl-methyl methacrylate. Because this compound was objected to by the Examiner and deleted from Claim 12, Applicants respectfully suggest that the Examiner's rejection is moot and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of Claim 12 as anticipated.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1–3 and 6–9 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Pardoen et al. in view of Fukada et al. While Pardoen et al. does not teach cyclic carbonate, the Examiner asserts that Fukada et al. teaches 2-oxo-1,3-dioxolane-4-yl-methyl methacrylate as a cross-linker between two substrates. Applicants have amended Claim 1 wherein if k is 1, X is does not expressly include $\text{CO-C}(\text{CH}_3)=\text{CH}_2$. In view of this amendment, Pardoen et al. cannot rely on Fukada et al. to provide the missing element for a finding of obviousness of Claim 1 and, accordingly, Claims 2, 3, 6-8, 13, and 15. Moreover, Applicants have deleted 2-oxo-1,3-dioxolan-4-ylmethyl methacrylate and 2-oxo-1,3-dioxolan-4-ylmethyl acrylate from Claim 9 in order to eliminate any impact of the teaching of Fukada et al. from Claim 9. In view of these amendments, Applicants respectfully assert that Fukada et al. is not combinable with Pardoen et al. such that Claims 1–3 and 6–9 might be considered obvious in view of these references. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of Claims 1–3 and 6–9 as obvious.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 10 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Fukada et al. (US 2003/0134926). Fukada et al. teaches 2-oxo-1,3-dioxolane-4-yl-methyl methacrylate. Applicants have amended Claim 10 wherein if R is $\text{C}_2\text{--C}_{12}$ -alkylene, $\text{CO-C}(\text{CH}_3)=\text{CH}_2$ is no longer listed as an additional possible substitution for X. Applicants believe Claim 10 is not obvious in view of Fukada et al. and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of Claim 10.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 11 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Fukada et al. (US 2003/0134926), further in view of Raab (U.S. 4,792,613). As the Examiner notes, Raab teaches a cyclic carbonate with a perfluorinated alkyl chain. Applicants believe that the amendment to Claim 10, as discussed in the preceding paragraph, causes the Examiner's rejection of Claim 11 to become moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of Claim 11.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4 and 5 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Pardoen et al. in view of Fukada et al. as applied to Claim 3, further in view of Van Hoen (U.S. 2004/0236119). In view of the amendment of Claim 1, above, which applies to dependent Claim

3, Applicants believe the teaching of Fukada et al. is not applicable to Claim 3. Accordingly, Claims 4 and 5 are not obvious over Pardoen et al. and Van Holen alone, i.e. without the teaching of Fukada et al. In view of this amendment and argument, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw his rejection of Claims 4 and 5 as obvious.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe the above amendments and arguments are fully responsive to the Examiner's objections and rejections and place this application into condition for allowance. For at least the reasons detailed herein, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of all objections and rejections, and allowance of all pending claims.

Applicants believe no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 03-2775, under Order No. 13744-00046-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Mark E. Freeman

Registration No.: 48,143

CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP

1007 North Orange Street

P.O. Box 2207

Wilmington, Delaware 19899

(302) 658-9141

(302) 658-5614 (Fax)

Attorney for Applicant